

Application No. 09/609,269
Amendment "C" dated March 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed January 7, 2005

REMARKS

Initially, Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on February 10, 2005. The claim amendments made by this paper are consistent with the proposals discussed during the interview.

The Office Action mailed January 7, 2005, considered and rejected claims 1, 3-14, 16-21 and 23-47 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowker (EP 0872990 A1) in view of Bouis (U.S. Patent No. 6,741,608)¹.

By this paper, claims 1, 13, 20, 33 and 35 have been amended and claims 5, 9-10, 25, 37, 40 and 47 have been cancelled such that claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 11-14, 16-21, 23-24, 26-36, 38-39 and 41-46 now remain pending, of which claims 1, 13, 20, 33 and 35 are the independent claims at issue.

As discussed during the interview, the pending claims are directed to embodiments for converting data in a first format to a second format. In particular, claim 1 and the corresponding computer program product claim 13 also include elements for converting data by identifying a sequence of format conversion modules that, when executed in sequence, converts the data from the first data format into the second data format and converting the data from the first data format into an intermediate data format using a first format conversion module in the sequence of data conversion modules and converting the data from the intermediate data format into the second data format using at least one second format conversion modules.

The remaining independent claims are directed to methods (claim 20), computer program products (claim 33) and systems (claim 35) that focus on embodiments in which the converting

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicants reserve the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

Application No. 09/609,269
Amendment "C" dated March 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed January 7, 2005

of the data is performed through the identification of a plurality of sequences of format conversion modules that each, when executed in sequence, converts the data from the first data format into the second data format.

As discussed during the interview, each of the independent claims has been amended to more clearly recite how the data conversion is performed in a network that includes a wireless device and how the wireless device is associated with a telephone number that is examined by the gateway to determine that the wireless system only recognizes data is a different format than an original format. Then, based at least in part on the telephone number, the system identifies a second format to convert the data into and uses a combination of different conversion modules to perform that conversion. The data is then sent to the wireless system.

The claims were rejected in the last action based on a combination of Bowker and Bouis. However, as discussed during the interview, and as generally agreed to by the Examiner and his supervisor, the amended claims appear to be distinguished over these references because they fail individually or in combination to teach or suggest the claimed embodiments that are recited in the pending claims.

Although Bouis and Bowker both generally relate to transcoding data from one format into a different format, these references fail to teach or suggest any method in which a gateway in communication with a wireless device 'receives a message from an originating computing system that includes data in a first data format and that is intended for a remote wireless system that has an associated telephone number; examines the message and identifies the telephone number of the remote wireless device, which is included as part of the message; and thereafter determines, based in part on the telephone number, that the wireless system only recognizes data

Application No. 09/609,269
Amendment "C" dated March 8, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed January 7, 2005

in one or more formats that are different than the first data format', and then subsequently performs the format conversion according to the variously claimed embodiments, as claimed.

Accordingly, for at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 11-14, 16-21, 23-24, 26-36, 38-39 and 41-46 are distinguished over the art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 8 day of March 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
JENS C. JENKINS
Registration No. 44,803
Attorneys for Applicant

Customer No. 47973

RDN:JCJ:cm
W:\13768\109.1\CM0000005562V001.DOC